

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
DARRYL L. WILLIAMS,

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Plaintiff,

-against-

MEMORANDUM & ORDER
11-CV-2076 (RRM)

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT,

Defendant.

-----X

MAUSKOPF, United States District Judge:

On April 26, 2011, plaintiff Darryl L. Williams, filed this *pro se* action alleging “patent [and] document discovery.” By Memorandum and Order dated May 4, 2011, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismissed Plaintiff’s Complaint, finding Plaintiff’s allegations to be irrational with no legal theory on which he may rely. Judgment entered the same day. On May 10, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and paid the requisite filing fee, which appeal was transferred to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit by Order and Mandate issued July 26, 2011.

On February 24, 2012 and March 26, 2012, Plaintiff submitted letters to this Court seeking “to reprieve [his] case” because “the reason [this Court] “suppressed the case was that it wasn’t enough information [sic].” In his letters, Plaintiff submitted additional information and drawings related to his original claim. The Court has reviewed those letters. Construing them liberally and interpreting them as raising the strongest arguments they suggest, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s additional submissions do not suffice to resurrect or otherwise amend his original claim, or in any way support – either legally or factually – any cognizable claim. *v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998) (observing that dismissal is proper where allegations are “product of delusion or fantasy”).

As these submissions do not give reason to believe that any valid claim may be stated, the Court finds no reason to vacate the Judgment or the Court's Memorandum and Order upon which it is based to allow Plaintiff to amend his claims or proceed with this action. *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000).

The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff *pro se* and indicate the mailing on the electronic docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2012

Brooklyn, New York

Roslynn R. Mauskopf

ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF
United States District Judge